that stage neither agree to the resolution nor to the amendment but all that they could say was that the question would be examined.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that so far as Government were concerned, it could be definitely stated that Mr. Byanna's amendment required an amendment of the Regulation.

MR. HOSAKOPPA KRISHNA RAO disagreed with this view and said that if each district was given the privilege of returning two members the remaining seats alone would be thrown open for nomination according to the principle enunciated by the Law Secretary. If there was no room for nomination, then there need be no nominations at all. He therefore thought that technically the motion was out of order, but that the amendment was quite in order.

As the motion was about to be upt to vote, MR. DASAPPA enquired what the final opinion of Government was.

THE DEWAN replied that Government could not express any view on the matter, but that the question would be reserved for further consideration. The members cannot expect Government to give a decision on every matter brought before the House then and there.

The resolution was not pressed to a division.

At this stage, the Assembly adjourned for lunch and re-assembled at 3-30 p.m.

MR. N. G. SANJEEVIAH desired to know whether the adjournment motion relating to the loss of three lives due to a motor bus accident near Nelamangala could be taken up for discussion.

THE DEWAN replied that he had disallowed the motion.

MR. B. P. BASAPPA SETTY then asked permission to discuss the adjournment motion in regard to the appointments in the Education Department.

THE THIRD MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that the matter was neither recent nor urgent. He promised however to give every information in connection with the Interpellation on the subject.

## RESOLUTIONS—(*Contd*).

### *Resolution No. 28.*

MR. S. V. GURUMURTHYACHARYA moved the following resolution:—

"That this Assembly recommends to the Government of His

Highness the Maharaja that they be pleased to declare the Renukacharya's Birthday as a Hindu Holiday."

In doing so he observed that the object of the resolution was based on the principle that facilities should be given to remember and worship every founder of a religion on the particular date consecrated to him. In this view he said Government should give at least a partial holiday on the Renukacharya's Birthday.

MR. B. L. BYANNA seconded the resolution.

MESSRS. SIDDALINGAPPA CHETTY and B. P. BASAPPA CHETTY supported the resolution. Mr. Siddalinga Chetty added that the same resolution was being brought before the House for the past 6 years and that there was no use discussing the subject as every member would support the resolution.

THE DEWAN said that Government were not in favour of increasing the number of the existing holidays which were already too many.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL added that Renukacharya and Basavacharya were two great personages of the Lingayet community and that both of them were honoured by the Lingayets. A partial holiday had already been granted for Basava Jayanti. It was not possible therefore to give another holiday for Renukacharya's Birthday.

MR. RAMADOSS said that if holidays were given for the celebration of the birthdays of great personages of every religion, he feared that there would be very few days left for office work.

MR. B. P. BASAPPA CHETTY said that in such matters, Government ought to give heed to the opinion of the people belonging to various sects.

MR. B. NARASINGA RAO was of opinion that as Sri Madva Navami, Sri Shankara Jayanthi and Sri Ramanujacharya Thirunakshatram were now being treated by Government as partial holidays, similarly Sri Renukacharya's Birthday might also be treated as a partial holiday.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that if that were done, it would prejudice the work in the schools as all partial holidays were treated as half holidays in schools. He thought that the existing number of holidays was already large and that it ought, on the other hand, to be reduced.

MR. M. VENKATAKRISHNAYYA was of opinion that all holidays might be abolished for obviating complaints of partiality.

MR. N. Y. PISSAY also was of the same opinion. He added that if the resolution was accepted, it was just possible that later on some member would suggest that Shivaji's Birthday and the birthdays of many other great Indian personages also should be observed as holidays.

MR. SUBBANNA NAIK said that during the time of Sir M. Visvesvaraya the number of holidays was reduced in consultation with the Representative Assembly. He did not think that any increase in the number of holidays was called for.

The resolution was put to vote and passed, 117 being in favour and none against.

*Resolution No. 27.*

MR. S. V. GURUMURTHYACHARYA moved the following resolution:—

"That this Assembly recommends to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja that they be pleased to adopt universally in all Government records, in future, the nomenclature 'Visvakarma' community instead of 'Panchala' or 'Akkasaliga,' as has been done in the case of Adikarnatakas, Adidravidas, Bhavasara Kshatriyas, Arya Vaishyas, Veerasaiva Brahmins and Kuruhina Settys."

MR. D. S. MALLAPPA seconded the resolution.

The resolution was put to vote and carried.

*Resolution No. 25.*

MR. H. C. DASAPPA moved the following resolution:—

"That this Assembly recommends to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja the desirability of deputing some officers of the Police Department for further training in their work to foreign countries and to London in particular."

In doing so, he said that the London Police were said to be very intelligent and that even the French Government sent their policemen for being trained in London. He understood that the Ceylon Government got its police trained in London. Mysore being a model state, he said that efficient training should be given to the Mysore Police also by sending suitable men to London for being trained at the Scotland Yard.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that Government would accept the resolution.

MR. H. C. DASAPPA then suggested that one Sergeant also might be sent along with the Officers to the Scotland Yard for training.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that that point also would be considered.

*Resolution No. 23.*

"That this Assembly recommends to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja that within a pericd of three years from now a Government Primary School be established in each Village Panchayet."

There was no discussion on this resolution tabled by Mr. M. C. Linge Gowda and many others, as the THIRD MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that Government accepted the position as far as possible and that a Bill in regard to the matter would be placed before the House for consideration on the Saturday following.

*Resolution No. 21.*

MR. V. VENKATAPPA then moved the following resolution:—

"That this Assembly recommends to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja that they may be pleased to appoint a mixed committee of non-officials and officials to consider and suggest reforms favourable to raiyats in connection with the Land Revenue Policy of the State."

In doing so, he invited the attention of Government to the speech made by him in the Legislative Council on a similar resolution brought by him in the course of which he had explained the necessity for the constitution of a committee as proposed in the present resolution. The Land Revenue Policy of Mysore was based on that of Bombay and the latter, since the recent Bardoli affair, was admitted by the Bombay Government to be defective in many particulars. Some of the defects in the Mysore Land Revenue system had been brought to the notice of Government during the previous sesssion in connection with resettlement of Hole-Narasipur and Kolar. He was of opinion that there was no fixed Land Revenue Policy in the State at all. The same opinion had been expressed by Mr. N. S. Subba Rao in his Report on Taxation in Mysore, in the course of which it was stated that "taxation in Mysore was not at all equitable and that the assessment was defective in respect of the canon of ability." Mr. Venkatappa further pointed out that the assessment at present levied did not proceed on any definite principle and that, unless a definite policy was laid down so that the people could know on what considerations

the assessment was levied, there would always be confusion as at present exsisting. For instance he said that in some cases irrigation cess was merged in land revenue, while in other cases it was additional levy. For all these reasons, he thought that the appointment of a committee was necessary to go into all details and make suitable recommendations.

In seconding the above resolution, MR. D. S. MALLAPPA said that Resolution No. 16, relating to the same subject might also be considered along with the present resolution. Among the most important defects noticed in the State Revenue Policy were the following:—

(1) Whether there was water in the tank or not and whether any crops were raised or not, no grant of remission was allowed in case the crops failed.

(2) In the re-survey, assessment had been increased to the extent of 20, 30 or even 50 per cent without any definite or reasonable data.

Protests were made to Government, as in Seringapatam, as a result of which Government reduced the assessment in some cases. In regard to the failure of crops on the lands below Marikanve, a resolution had been brought before the Legislative Council and the then Dewan, Sir Albion Banerji, allowed certain concessions to the people.

(3) In connection with resettlement of T.-Narsipur Taluk, several defects were brought to the notice of Government but the Government were not pleased to show any concessions at all.

(4) In regard to the assessment, he said the rules were revised with the ostensible reason of giving some concessions to the raiyats; yet, in practice, owing to a lot of restrictions placed on the Revenue Officers, adequate remissions were not given at all. For instance, before the year 1919, the total assessment of the State was about one crore and odd and in 10 years it doubled itself although the amount of remissions was not commensurate with the land revenue. That to his mind clearly proved that there was something wrong somewhere in the working of the remission rules.

It was incumbent on the Government to remedy all the above and other defects and maintain a uniform Land Revenue Policy. It should be admitted that the land revenue system of Mysore, based as it was on that of Bombay, was defective. The Bombay Government themselves had admitted this. In the Madras Presidency also, it was understood

that efforts were being made to alter their Land Revenue system. The average raiyat of Mysore was poor and ignorant and his sufferings were not properly realised by Government. In order to give real relief to the raiyat population, he thought that it was quite necessary that a committee of non-official and official members should be appointed to make an exhaustive investigation into the matter and suggest a proper Land Revenue Policy.

MR. RAMADOSS in supporting the resolution said that the Bardoli raiyats were a hundred times better situated than the Mysore raiyats. In Mysore, assessment differed in different places. The raiyats were not only poor but also without credit. Even though the revenue officers were fully satisfied as to the need for remission, yet, on account of the restrictions placed on them in the remission rules, they could not recommend remissions at all. If such conditions were allowed to continue any longer, it would be impossible for the raiyats to improve their lot. In those circumstances, he said that elaborate investigations should be made into the Land Revenue Policy of Mysore by a committee.

MR. B. NARASINGA RAO observed that this was a general grievance, that there was nothing particular in the resolution that required to be discussed and that there was no difference of opinion in regard to the question of revising the Land Revenue Policy by a committee as proposed in the resolution.

MR. L. VEMA REDDY thought that there was absolutely no principle on which the levy of assessment was based. The Survey Departmental Officers were very intelligent and capable of interpreting any rule in such a way as to close the mouths of the protesting raiyats. When any question arose, the departmental officers convinced the raiyats of the propriety of the action of the Department without doing anything to alleviate their sufferings. The Survey Department would always ask the raiyats to prove their case. It was difficult for an ignorant raiyat to marshal all the evidence and facts to prove his case without any knowledge of outside conditions. His case was one of real poverty. He and his family were insufficiently clothed, insufficiently fed and yet no kind of concession was shown to him. The Government might show to the outside world that conditions in Mysore were first class while the raiyats in the interior were suffering from the pangs of poverty. It was the duty of Government to see that the raiyats were provided with at least the bare necessities of life and make them prosperous. Government

might advance the argument that if the assessment were reduced it would be difficult to carry on the administration. But the main point to be considered by them was whether the raiyat was able to pay the heavy assessment that was levied on him. He observed that the crops now raised by the raiyat on account of want of rain and scarcity of water were not sufficient for him for his maintenance for a period of even 3 months. While such was the deplorable condition of the raiyat, it was but necessary that something should be done to relieve him of his sufferings. Under those circumstances, he thought that a committee should be appointed forthwith to examine the Land Revenue Policy of Government.

MR. VENKATAVARADACHAR suggested that instead of appointing a separate committee as prayed for in the resolution, it was sufficient to accept the opinion of the members of the Assembly a large majority of whom were raiyats and to remit all the increase that was made during the re-survey.

A large number of the members of the House spoke in favour of the resolution.

The resolution was thereupon put to vote and carried unanimously.

*Resolution No. 19.*

"That this Assembly recommends to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja that (*a*) compulsory physical education may be introduced in all Middle Schools, High Schools and Colleges in the State; and (*b*) that immediate steps be taken to formulate a scheme to introduce military training in High Schools and Colleges."

MR. B. P. BASAPPA SETTY moved the above resolution with the following amendment :—

"In line 2, substitute a comma for the semi-colon after the word 'State' and add the following :—'and also suggests to form a Committee to find ways and means to solve this problem.'"

While doing so, he invited the attention of the Government to a similar resolution brought up in the Bombay Legislative Council.

THE THIRD MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that the object of Government was to do all that was wanted in the resolution in all the schools.

MR. SIDDALINGA DEVARU said that it was no use doing it unless it was made compulsory. He was of opinion that no promotion should be given to a boy unless he attended the physical culture classes.

MR. B. P. BASAPPA CHETTY next desired to know what the opinion of Government was in regard to the formation of a committee to find ways and means to solve the problem.

THE DEWAN replied that there was no use appointing a committee, but the point might be considered by the Board of Education.

The principle of the remaining part of the resolution was however accepted by Government.

*Resolution No. 20.*

MR. B. L. BYANNA then moved the following resolution :—

"That this Assembly recommends to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja that the Newspapers Regulation of 1908 be repealed without substituting anything therefor."

In doing so, he observed that, according to the provisions of the Regulation as in force at present, previous permission of Government was required before starting a newspaper. Such a rule, he said, was not in force anywhere in British India. The existence itself of the present Newspaper Regulation was a disgrace to the fair name of Mysore. Hence, he commended the resolution to the kind acceptance of the House unanimously.

MR. S. N. M. RAZVI in seconding the resolution observed that the subject of the repeal of the Press Law in Mysore had been largely discussed in the previous sessions of the Representative Assembly and the Legislative Council and and that there had been differences of opinion among the members in regard to it, some of them maintaining that it was necessary that the Press Law should be repealed and the others maintaining that it should not be repealed at the present stage, as there were many bad writers and that their writings had to be controlled. With reference to the view of the latter class of members, he did not know whether it was their intention that the Law should be repealed only when good writers and good articles would be forthcoming. But, he said no one could wait for such a time nor would ever such a time occur. There were good and bad people in all places at all times. If at any place there were bad writers and their writings were not tolerable, he did not know why, for the sake of such persons who were after all a few in number, the whole public should be made to suffer by the curtailment of their liberty of speech or writing. The voice of the public was represented by the press and it

should not be gagged. He was quite sure that no one gave expression to sentiments against His Highness either on the platform or in the press. All people loved His Highness. The press disseminated sound common sense and educated the masses. No amount of reading text-books could, he said, educate a man so much as reading of newspapers. Hence, in his opinion, it was quite necessary that there should be newspapers without any control being exercised on them whatsoever. He was of opinion that the public press improved the country and that no country could prosper unless there was freedom of the press.

MR. KATTE DAKAPPA observed that there existed no necessity for the Regulation to continue when there were ample provisions in the Indian Penal Code to punish persons writing scurrilous articles, etc.

MR. GOPALA CHAR, while agreeing with the above view, said that even though the press Regulation had been repealed in British India, it was not done so in Mysore although a promise was held out by Government in the Legislative Council held during March 1928 to repeal the present Regulation and substitute another in its place. As the press was the only way by which knowledge could be disseminated among the masses, he requested Government to repeal the Law at once.

MR. KRISHNASWAMI RAO thought that by allowing the Newspaper Regulation to remain on the Statute Book, a larger impetus was given to the writers of newspaper articles to go outside Mysore and publish them. The effect of this was that a larger circle of people were enabled to know what was happening in Mysore than it would otherwise have been possible if editors were permitted to start newspapers freely in the State. For this reason he thought that the Regulation might be abolished forthwith and freedom given to the people to start newspapers without obtaining previous permission from Government.

MR. E. KRISHNAPPA observed that, following the promise held out by Government to repeal the Law, the Assembly members were hoping that a new Bill in place of the old Regulation would be brought by Government before them, at least in the present session as it was the last session of the present triennium. But the members were very much disappointed to see that nothing was done by Government.

In this connection, he invited the attention of Government to the observation of Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, who had gone to America in connection with disarmament proposals,

wherein he stated that if there should at all be international friendship between the various nationalities, there should be complete freedom of the press. Under the existing conditions, people in Mysore had to know the happenings in Mysore from Madras papers. He did not know why such a state of things should be allowed to continue. He therefore thought the Newspaper Regulation should be abolished, and the sooner that was done, the more the public would appreciate that act.

MR. B. LINGE GOWDA in opposing the resolution as it stood observed that although many members had spoken a lot on the liberty of the press and liberty of speech, yet, they had not considered the point whether the present situation justified the repeal of the Press Law. In his opinion, the way in which certain newspapers in Mysore behaved in the past did not justify the absolute repeal of the Press Law. He instanced the cases of indecent behaviour of certain papers, as "To-day" "Veerakesari" and "Sadhvi" which, for having resorted to writing all sorts of articles prejudicial to the country, had been punished by Government.

He added that there was also another point to be considered and that was what effect the dissemination of writings of all sorts against the Government would have on the villagers in the remotest parts of the State.

It was stated that if papers were not started here at all, there would be no means of knowing the happenings in Mysore. He thought that there was no harm in that because the raiyats read only Kannada papers and that newspapers in Mysore would generally be in Kannada, while English papers would not reach them at all. If writings against the interests of the State were allowed to be circulated to the raiyats, the latter, being ignorant, would believe that all that was written there was correct, and be disaffected against the Government. In those circumstances, he said that the absolute liberty of the press should not be given in the best interests of the country.

MR. M. S. LINGE GOWDA said that it was necessary that newspapers should be circulated among the villagers also, but with proper safeguards. And it was also necessary to see that falsehoods should not be disseminated or dissensions created among them. He thought that the recent disturbances in Bangalore and Davangere were mainly due to newspaper articles.

Many members said that that was not the reason.

Then, referring to the opinion expressed at the previous

session of the Assembly in regard to the same matter, Mr. M. S. Linge Gowda continuing observed that the conditions had not materially changed since then and that there was still a necessity for the Newspaper Regulation to continue. He did not think that if newspapers were not allowed to be started, any very great catastrophe would happen in Mysore.

MR. HOSAKOPA KRISHNA RAO very strongly supported the resolution. With reference to the statements made by some of the previous speakers to the effect that the time had not come for the repeal of the Press Regulation, he said that the term "present condition" required to be carefully examined. He did not know whether it meant that there should be less freedom of speech and freedom of the press in the present 20th century, especially in a model and enlightened State like Mysore, or, that the communal dissensions were due to the writings in the public press. Freedom of speech and freedom of press were fundamental rights which none could deny. Those rights had been obtained in every country with not a little fighting.

It was stated that last year some papers wrote a lot against the Mysore Government. But, he thought that no attention need be paid to the foreign papers at all, for the simple reason that Government had no control over them. If somebody wrote without discretion, he did not see why the Assembly should say that there should be a Newspaper Regulation. He observed that scurrilous articles were a feature of some newspapers in every country. For that reason such countries would not put a ban on newspapers straightaway. He thought that because some people wrote scurrilous articles there should be no liberty of press in the country, was altogether a fallacious argument. Whatever reasons existed for passing the Newspaper Regulation in the beginning, he thought that those same reasons did not exist any more. When the question was discussed at a previous session, the Government promised that they would not curtail the liberty of the press unnecessarily, as after all their interest and that of the people were identical. At that time there was no trouble and there was also considerable agitation in favour of the liberty of the press. But, it appeared to him that there was a change of front on the part of the Government as the promise made by them had not so far been fulfilled. He did not think that public opinion could be suppressed in that fashion. Government on the other hand ought to invite public opinion. If any

people wrote questionable articles in the newspapers, Government had the right to put them before the courts. He thought that criticisms were more often than not good correctives. He admitted that sometimes they might be wrong, but, for the most part they were useful. Newspapers were a public instrument guarding the safety of the people and exposing any vagaries of the administration. By the suppression of the liberty of the press, Government could certainly suppress the editor of a paper from writing anything, but, it would not dissuade him from still entertaining the opinions he held.

With reference to the remarks made by certain members that people would generally believe all that was written in newspapers, he said that it was a wrong idea. The raiyats, he thought, had better common sense than others. He also said that it was false to say that newspapers caused disturbances. For all these reasons he thought that the Government should reconsider the matter and abolish the Regulation.

MR. YELANDUR SRINIVASA IYENGAR said that newspapers were the best instruments for the dissemination of knowledge among the people. Even 40 years back the Government of Mysore helped people to start newspapers. The editors of newspapers were generally educated and talented people who knew their rights and liabilities. If some people erred, it was no reason why ban should be put on all people desiring to start newspapers.

MR. B. S. PUTTASWAMY observed that from the resolution, as it stood, it was clear to him that there should be no Press Regulation at all. If such a thing was allowed, then the inevitable result would be that newspapers could not be proceeded against unless defamatory articles were written. Of course, legal action could be taken on defamatory articles; but, he doubted whether it would be possible for all people to resort to a Court of Law. For instance, if there was no Press Regulation, it would be impossible to proceed against a newspaper writing defamatory articles against His Highness. Hence, he thought that some sort of control was necessary. He admitted however that the present Regulation was drastic and that a new but milder regulation might be substituted for it, as already promised by Government.

MR. M. C. LINGE GOWDA said that the mass of the people in the country being ignorant, some sort of protection of the kind mentioned in the Regulation was absolutely

necessary. It was impossible for the raiyats to resort at once to the Courts of Law if any scurrilous writings against them were published. Moreover, he thought that as the presiding officers of courts were all of the same community they would not be able to properly appreciate the difficulties of the raiyats. Hence he was for the existing control to continue.

MR. RAMADOSS pointed out, with reference to the possible hardships to the raiyats by the existence of the Newspaper Regulation, that the raiyats would care very little whether the Regulation was abolished or not. The average Mysore raiyat was still backward in education and instead of realising that he was in the 20th century, he was actually many centuries behind. All that was wanted at present was good feeling between the people and whatever promoted to the development of that feeling should be encouraged. In this view, he thought that the Newspaper Regulation was a necessity.

MR. MANJIAH who next spoke expressed himself against the repeal of the Press Law.

MR. H. C. DASAPPA in opposing the Resolution observed that there were some agitators in Mysore in whom it had become a disease to write scurrilous articles against Government to foreign press and give false information, thus giving room for dissensions in the State. Although the number of such people did not exceed 20, yet, he said, they posed themselves as if they were the public and the views contained in the articles contributed by them as representing the public opinion.

Referring to the statement of Mr. Hosakoppa Krishna Rao that the public felt dissatisfied about the existence of the Press Regulation, Mr. H. C. Dasappa said that he did not know what was meant by the word 'public' and how the existence of the Regulation caused dissatisfaction in them. Such a public, including its followers, he said, numbered only a few and the Press Act existed not for them but for the whole State.

MR. B. L. BYANNA rose to a point of order and said that the speaker was imputing motives indirectly.

MR. H. C. DASAPPA replied that it was not his idea to impute motives to anybody.

Then, referring to another statement of Mr. Hosakoppa Krishna Rao to the effect that liberty of speech and liberty of press were the birthright of people, Mr. H. C. Dasappa asked whether they fell in the same category as

primary education or drinking water wells. He thought that it was not.

Continuing, he said that even such a great man as Prima de Vera had said that there should be a Newspaper Regulation, some sort of censorship, to prevent the dissemination of scurrilous news likely to influence the public and to create conflicts of interests and dissensions. It was on that principle, he said, that even in British India, some sort of control was maintained over the press there. No permission to start a paper was given there, if it should create dissensions. It was for this reason, he said, that there should be some sort of control over the press in Mysore. He did not think that the existence of the Newspaper Regulation was any great hardship to the people at all. There were many newspapers in existence still circulating in the country and going on right lines without fear of the Regulation at all. He agreed with Mr. B. S. Puttaswamiah in that respect and added that restrictions should be placed on the press for some time to come at least, as otherwise, the people of rural parts would surely fall a victim to the influence of scurrilous writings, in some newspapers. He also said that he had no objection for another Bill being substituted for the present Regulation, provided Government thereby kept control over the press.

MR. P. SUBBARAMA CHETTY stressed the point that there should be freedom of speech and freedom of the press without which no country would become prosperous. In this connection, he invited the attention of the House to an observation made by Lord Morley wherein it was stated that freedom of the press and speech in India was a crown to Britain.

He did not agree to the view put forward by a certain speaker that the Press Regulation should be retained as there were bad writers. As in one's family there might be bad and good members, so also in a State, he said, there might be good and bad people and it was his view that the duty of the administrators was to mend the bad people. They should adopt a mending policy and not an ending policy. There were ample provisions in the Indian Penal Code to deal with persons going beyond the bounds of law. There were also executive orders of Government empowering them to confiscate the property of the press, when deemed necessary. And, on the other hand, if there were any faults in the Government themselves, that also ought to be mended. He pointed out that the very idea of giving the

representatives of the people in the Assembly powers to table interpellations and put supplementary questions and answers was to remove defects, if any, in the administration. Similarly, the Government should welcome public criticisms also, both for and against, with a view to remove defects, if any, in themselves. Under such circumstances, he said that there should be freedom of press and freedom of speech.

MR. D. S. MALLAPPA thought that the world would not come to an end if the Regulation was abolished forthwith. If the Regulation was abolished, he thought that it would facilitate very experienced and talented people even from outside coming to Mysore and starting newspapers. If the Government dissuaded the local people from starting newspapers, there was no prohibition to sending articles to outside press and getting them circulated in Mysore. In this view, he did not think that the existence of the Regulation would be of any very great help to Government. He was firmly of opinion that no country would prosper until the press was given its full liberty.

MR. B. L. BYANNA in replying to the debate said that, owing to the existence of the Newspaper Regulation, a number of local people had to go outside and publish news about Mysore. He admitted that many people wrote strong articles against the State in some newspapers. But, as those articles were in English, how they could mislead the raiyats was a matter which he could not know. It was admitted on all hands in the Assembly that the mass of the people were ignorant. While such was the case, it was difficult to understand how they could be influenced by such writings.

Referring to Mr. H. C. Dasappa's statement that the opinions of the raiyats of Mysore would be much prejudiced if papers containing articles on Mysore were circulated among them, he asked whether Mr. Dasappa got the information from the people of his constituency and if so, which that constituency was. He was of opinion that the knowledge gained by the people from the reading of newspapers would stand the people in good stead. So many things which were not ordinarily available to the people would be known to them. He admitted that people who wrote unreasonably against the Government should be brought to justice and it was the duty of every member of the House to help Government in doing so.

In conclusion, he said that Government ought to do everything that was calculated to bring fame and name to

the State. The Newspaper Regulation was a blot on the administration and as such, it should be removed forthwith.

On behalf of the Government, the LEGAL REMEMBRANCER first invited the attention of the mover of the resolution to the proceedings of the Legislative Council wherein it had been said that the following amendment was thereupon suggested, *viz.*, to add at the end of Mr. Gundappa's resolution the words:—

"providing at the same time any measures that may be considered necessary in the interests of the State."

It was only with this amendment, he said, that the original resolution of Mr. Gundappa was accepted by Government. But, the Legal Remembrancer pointed out that the one under discussion was opposed to the above resolution. The present resolution required an absolute repeal of the Press Law. Referring to this point, he said that even in British India there was no absolute repeal of the Press Law, as was alleged by some members. In the year 1910, there was a Press Act and it was in force till the year 1920. When it was repealed, its provisions were embodied in various other Acts, such as, the Sea Customs Act, the Post Office Act, the Press and Registration Act of 1867 and Amendments to Sections 99 (A) to (G) of the Criminal Procedure Code, it being thought that there should be some sort of control over the writings in the press. Hence, he said the argument that there was perfect freedom of the press in British India was not correct.

Referring to the point that freedom of the Press was the absolute birthright of the people, as stated by a certain member, the Legal Remembrancer said that beyond the term "absolute" being very commonly used, such an absolute right did not exist anywhere, and that a man's rights were always limited by those of the neighbours and the community in general. Hence, in the interests of society, some restriction was always placed on the absolute right of every person. The rights that one enjoyed were always conditional on the exercise of similar rights of his neighbours. The principle of the law was "see sideways and exercise your right."

The Legal Remembrancer then pointed out that it would not be reasonable to claim the same extent of rights and privileges as in the West.

Then, referring to the change in the tone of some newspapers, he said that those papers were probably under the impression that the more they blamed the Government the

greater would be their value. But he thought that it was not so. On the other hand, such writings, he said, would lose their value on account of their exaggeration. There ought to be some discrimination in the writings. If the papers had realised this truth, he thought that certainly the Press Regulation would not have been still in the Statute Book. He then invited the attention of the members to an important observation made by Dewan Bahadur Rangachariár in the course of a public speech made by him at the Y.M.C.A., when he stated that there was a code of honor in journalism and that if the newspapers did not violate journalistic etiquette, their writings would be respected both by the Government and the people. It was the duty of the newspapers to always publish a true statement of facts and to leave the readers to form their own opinion. The newspapers must therefore write impartially actuated by no personal motives and attaching themselves to no party or faction. If they did not do so, they were not entitled to any consideration. As a rule, most of the newspapers made wide departures from the above standard. Hence, he said there must be some control.

Referring to the observation of one of the members that the Newspaper Regulation was not fit to be in the Statute Book in the 20th century, he said that if the journalistic etiquette was judged by the recognised code of honour of the 20th century, it must be said that some of the present day journalists seemed to belong not to the 20th century, but to at least six centuries behind it. The conditions in British India were quite different from those in Indian States. He however added that it was not the intention of the Government that the present measure should remain for all time. They acknowledged that there were some drastic provisions in it. They have an idea of introducing another enactment containing suitable modifications, and, as already promised by them, they would introduce such a measure very early.

On the above assurance, the resolution was withdrawn by the mover.

At this stage, the Assembly rose for the day to meet again the next day at 12 Noon.